

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-41 and 76-104 remain pending in the application. The Office Action withdrew claims 3-10, 13-18, 20-24, 27, 28, 30-35, 38, 39 and 41-75 from consideration. By this Amendment, the abstract is amended; and claims 1, 19 and 29 are amended. No new matter is added.

In numbered paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Abstract is objected to for informalities. The Abstract is amended to address the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication in numbered paragraph 7 of the Office Action that claims 80, 93, 94, 100 and 102 contain allowable subject matter. However, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 19 and 29 are patentably distinct and afford Applicants a scope of protection to which they are entitled given the documents relied upon by the Examiner. The Examiner has failed to recognize significant features recited in Applicants' claims.

In numbered paragraph 4 of the Office Action, independent claims 1, 19 and 29, along with dependent claims 2 and 40, are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,659,322 (Caille). In numbered paragraph 5 of the Office Action, dependent claims 11, 12, 25, 26, 36, 37, 86, 87, 89, 92, 98, 99 and 101 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Caille patent in view of U.S. Patent 5,724,666 (Dent). In numbered paragraph 6 of the Office Action, dependent claims 76-79, 81-85, 88, 90, 91, 95-97, 103 and 104 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Caille patent in

view of Dent, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,915,213 (Iwatsuki et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed an apparatus and method for full duplex wireless communication of information. As shown in by Fig. 1, an exemplary transmitter includes means for performing at least one of modulating and demodulating information signals (102, 104, 106) and means for information transmission/reception 108. The information transmission can use a first polarization and the information reception can use a second polarization to isolate information transmission from information reception in full duplex communication (e.g., page 8, lines 17-24).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites, among other features, information transmission/reception means providing for information transmission using a first polarization and for information reception using a second polarization to thereby isolate information transmission from information reception in full duplex communication. Claims 19 and 29 recite similar features.

The Caille patent discloses a microwave transmit/receive circuit which alternates between transmit and receive modes using switches 25 and 52 controlled by a synchronization clock 24 (col. 1, lines 46-48; and col. 6, lines 26-29). However, the Caille patent does not teach or suggest information transmission/reception means providing for information transmission using a first polarization and for information reception using a second polarization to thereby isolate information transmission from information reception in full duplex communication, as recited in claim 1. Claims 19 and 29 recite similar features. Claims 1, 19 and 29 are therefore allowable.

The Dent patent was cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of a base station including first and second antenna arrays for receiving first and second rotational polarizations (col. 4, lines 45-55); and the Iwatsuki patent was cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of an IF circuit 10 and a local frequency circuit 30 in Fig. 2. However, the Dent and Iwatsuki patents do not cure the deficiencies of the Caille patent. The Dent and Iwatsuki patents, considered individually or in combination with the Caille patent, do not teach or suggest at least information transmission/reception means providing for information transmission using a first polarization and for information reception using a second polarization to thereby isolate information transmission from information reception in full duplex communication, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 19 and 29.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1, 19 and 29 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. Further, because the withdrawn claims depend from the respective generic and independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: July 11, 2005

By: 
Reg No. 48,360

Patrick O. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620